

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 6 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Eck (previously applied) in view of U.S. Patent 5,980,336 to Hall et al. (hereafter, "Hall et al.").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted in Applicants' previous response dated August 2, 2006, Eck discloses a contact for a connector having a barrel portion having a layer of a reflowable solderable material disposed on the inner and outer surfaces thereof. The barrel is expansible from a first to a second dimension upon the insertion of a camming member thereinto. The contact is disposed in a connector that is used in conjunction with a pin header and a board with plated through holes therein. The barrels, when inserted into the through holes from one surface of the board, are expanded by the receipt of pins or wires inserted into the barrels from a header disposed on the other side of the board.

Eck discloses that reflowable solderable material coats the inner and outer surfaces and column 4, lines 44-50 define reflowable solderable material as follows:

The term "reflowable solderable material" is meant to include any alloy which when exposed to a temperature of approximately 420°F. goes from a solid to a flowable state. Preferably the material is a 60/40 or 93/7 alloy of tin and lead. A thickness of each layer 32, 34 on the order of two hundred to three hundred micro inches is preferred.

This is in contrast to the present invention, in which the conductive plating is composed of tin, gold, silver, nickel or palladium. Because the plated second conductive portion is bent into “a shape having an annular transverse cross section,” the reflowable solderable material of Eck would not be a satisfactory material for the plating, since the reflowable solderable material is brittle when solid and not easily shaped.

In the present invention, the plating layers for the conductive plate material are formed from one of gold, silver, copper, nickel, palladium and tin, as disclosed from page 6, line 25 to page 26, line 1 of the specification of the instant application. In the present invention, the tin used as plating layer material is not used with any another metal in a reflowable solderable alloy.

The Examiner has cited Hall et al. for teaching the use of a tin plating for a terminal to prevent corrosion.

Neither of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggest an auxiliary connecting portion (21) formed from a portion of the main body portion (2) and bent so as to be parallel to the first connecting portion (1), which is bent at a right angle to the main body portion (2), as shown in FIG. 1 of the instant application.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite this feature.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ward (previously applied) in view of Eck and Hall et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Ward discloses a spring receptacle 34 which is connected to the shank 28 by a laterally extending reversely being connecting neck section 36 (see column 2, lines 39-42 and FIGS. 2 and 3). In order to form the spring receptacle 34, the larger area of strip metal is needed, which lead to an increase of manufacturing costs. On the other hand, the auxiliary connecting portion of claim 1, as amended, is formed from a portion of the main body portion leaving an opening in the main body portion which does not need any additional part of conductive plate material in comparison with Ward. Thus, Ward fails teach, mention or suggest the construction of the auxiliary connecting portion of claim 1, as amended, of the instant application.

Ward, like Eck and Hall et al. discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the new proposed limitations to claims 1 and 6, from which claims 4, 5 and 9 depend.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ward in view of Eck, Hall et al., and Neff et al. (previously applied).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Neff et al., like the other cited references discussed above, fails to teach, mention or suggest the proposed new limitations to claims 1 and 6, from which these claims depend.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1 and 3-10, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/537,436  
Response to Office Action dated October 19, 2006

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,  
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

  
William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak  
Atty. Docket No. 050323  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE